

NEPA/CEQA RE-VALIDATION FORM

DIST./CO./RTE.	12/ORA/133
PM/PM	3.1-3.6
E.A. or Fed-Aid Project No.	0N060/1213000097
Other Project No. (specify)	
PROJECT TITLE	Safety Project
ENVIRONMENTAL APPROVAL TYPE	Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration Categorical Exclusion
DATE APPROVED	September 1, 2017
REASON FOR CONSULTATION (23 CFR 771.129)	Check reason for consultation: <input type="checkbox"/> Project proceeding to next major federal approval <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Change in scope, setting, effects, mitigation measures, requirements <input type="checkbox"/> 3-year timeline (EIS only) <input type="checkbox"/> N/A (Re-Validation for CEQA only)
DESCRIPTION OF CHANGED CONDITIONS	Briefly describe the changed conditions or new information on page 2. Append continuation sheet(s) as necessary. Include a revised Environmental Commitments Record (ECR) when applicable.

NEPA CONCLUSION - VALIDITY

Based on an examination of the changed conditions and supporting information: [Check ONE of the three statements below, regarding the validity of the original document/determination (23 CFR 771.129). If document is no longer valid, indicate whether additional public review is warranted and whether the type of environmental document will be elevated.]

- ☒ The original environmental document or CE remains valid. No further documentation will be prepared.
- ☐ The original environmental document or CE is in need of updating; further documentation has been prepared and ☐ is included on the continuation sheet(s) or ☐ is attached. With this additional documentation, the original ED or CE remains valid.
- Additional public review is warranted (23 CFR 771.111(h)(3)) Yes ☐ No ☐
- ☐ The original document or CE is no longer valid.
- Additional public review is warranted (23 CFR 771.111(h)(3)) Yes ☐ No ☐
- Supplemental environmental document is needed. Yes ☐ No ☐
- New environmental document is needed. Yes ☐ No ☐ (If "Yes," specify type: _____)

CONCURRENCE WITH NEPA CONCLUSION

I concur with the NEPA conclusion above.

Signature: Environmental Branch Chief

Date

Signature: Project Manager/DLAE

Date

CEQA CONCLUSION: (Only mandated for projects on the State Highway System.)

Based on an examination of the changed conditions and supporting information, the following conclusion has been reached regarding appropriate CEQA documentation: (Check ONE of the five statements below, indicating whether any additional documentation will be prepared, and if so, what kind. If additional documentation is prepared, attach a copy of this signed form and any continuation sheets.)

- ☐ Original document remains valid. No further documentation is necessary.
- ☒ Only minor technical changes or additions to the previous document are necessary. An addendum has been or will be ☐ prepared and is ☒ included on the continuation sheets or ☐ will be attached. It need not be circulated for public review. (CEQA Guidelines, §15164)
- ☐ Changes are substantial, but only minor additions or changes are necessary to make the previous document adequate. A Supplemental environmental document will be prepared, and it will be circulated for public review. (CEQA Guidelines, §15163)
- ☐ Changes are substantial, and major revisions to the current document are necessary. A Subsequent environmental document will be prepared, and it will be circulated for public review. (CEQA Guidelines, §15162) (Specify type of subsequent document, e.g., Subsequent FEIR)
- ☐ The CE is no longer valid. New CE is needed. Yes ☐ No ☐

CONCURRENCE WITH CEQA CONCLUSION

I concur with the CEQA conclusion above.

Signature: Environmental Branch Chief

Date

Signature: Project Manager/DLAE

Date

NEPA/CEQA RE-VALIDATION FORM

CONTINUATION SHEET(S)

Address only changes or new information since approval of the original document and only those areas that are applicable. Use the list below as section headings as they apply to the project change(s). Use as much or as little space as needed to adequately address the project change(s) and the associated impacts, minimization, avoidance and/or mitigation measures, if any.

Changes in project design, e.g., scope change; a new alternative; change in project alignment

See continuation sheet.

Changes in environmental setting, e.g., new development affecting traffic or air quality;

The environmental setting as presented in the IS/MND has not changed because of the scope changes.

Changes in environmental circumstances, e.g., a new law or regulation; change in the status of a listed species.

The environmental circumstances are the same as those presented in the IS/MND.

Changes to environmental impacts of the project, e.g., a new type of impact, or a change in the magnitude of an existing impact.

The scope changes will not result in any new environmental impacts. The new slope design will actually result in less ground disturbance.

Changes to avoidance, minimization, and/or mitigation measures since the environmental document was approved.

All measures listed in the IS/MND/CE would still apply.

Changes to environmental commitments since the environmental document was approved, e.g., the addition of new conditions in permits or approvals. When this applies, append a revised Environmental Commitments Record (ECR) as one of the Continuation Sheets.

Commitments required by the County to comply with section 4(f) have been added to the ECR.

NEPA/CEQA RE-VALIDATION FORM

Changes in project design (e.g., scope change, a new alternative, change in project alignment)

Caltrans has been coordinating with stakeholders, including the City of Laguna Beach and OC Parks to identify further refinements to the project design to minimize impacts within Laguna Coast Wilderness Park (LCWP). At the request of OC Parks, Caltrans is considering a hybrid option that would include a combination of a low retaining wall/minimal slope grading (in lieu of the 1.5:1 for the SR-133 Improvement Project) to minimize impacts to the natural resources in this area and to LCWP near the intersection of El Toro Road. However, engineering studies are still underway regarding the feasibility of this option. In addition to modifying the slope, changes of the original project scope for the SR-133 Safety Project also includes constructing a "Keep Clear Zone" and associated HMA apron at the Willow Staging Area access and relocating the Willow Staging Area entrance monument. After reviewing the modified design plans and the project maps, it was concluded that there would be temporary impacts during construction associated with the new elements; however, the Section 4(f) use would not alter the conclusions and with implementation of TRA-1, the impacts would be minimized. Since the Traffic Management Plan (TMP) is already included as part of the measure TRA-1 as discussed in the original and approved Section 4(f) and Final Environmental Document, no additional analysis and information is needed.